THE LIBRARY OF
HAVERFORD COLLEGE

A Fair

EXAMINATION

Of a Foul

PAPER,

Called

OBSERVATIONS and REFLECTIONS, &c.

Lately Publiſhed by *John Raunce* and *Leonard Key*.

Wherein their **Envy** is Rebuked, and their *Folly* and *Falſhood* laid open, By **Thomas Elwood**.

WE Read among the Proverbs of *Solomon*, that *the way of the Wicked is as darkneſs, they know not at what they ſtumble*, *Prov.* 4. 19. This is verified in *John Raunce*, *L. Key*, and others of their Separate Party. Since their turning againſt the Truth, their *Way* is become as *Darkneſs*; They *ſtumble* and know not at what. They fall into many idle Abſurdities, many groſs Follies and Errors, and into many hurtful Evils, and labour to draw others (better than themſelves) after them: For whoſe ſake chiefly the following Lines are Written, that the Deceit and Hypocriſy of theſe men, their *Falſhood* and *Envy* being further and further laid open, the more ſimple and well meaning ones amongſt them, may ſee them as they are, and be no longer beguiled by them.

John Raunce begins his Reflective Paper thus; *If T. E. would make it really appear, that we are ſuch bad Perſons as he would have us, then ſome body might know he had done ſomething*, &c. To which I ſay, truly I would not have them be ſuch *bad* Perſons as they are, if I could help it; and I am ſorry they are ſo *bad*: but that *they are bad*, I believe I have plainly proved in ſeveral Printed Papers, of which I am content the Reader ſhould judge. He ſaith, *There is no-*

thing of Evil I have proved againſt them. I ſay, if *Lying, Falſe Ac*
cuſing, Railing, Reviling, countenancing *looſe* and diſorderly Perſon
in Marriages, *Backbiting, Envy, Diviſion* and *Separation, Impoſition*
Perſecution, in ſhutting up *Meeting-Houſes,* and keeping Friend
out of their Rights and Properties; if theſe may paſs with him fo
Evils, I am perſwaded I have proved theſe things upon that Part
which he is one of. He charges me to be *in ſuch work as one of h*
Diſciples who is the Accuſer of the Brethren. I return this upon him
ſelf and his own Party. They are the Accuſers of the Brethren
For they have ſoully and *falſly accuſed* many faithful Friends, callin
them, and that publickly to the World in Print, *Apoſtates Inn*
vators, Idolaters, ſetters up of Images, Introducers of Popery, &c. An
yet (in Deceit and Flattery, to creep in again) have called the
Brethren. So that it is they that are indeed *The Accuſers of the Br*
thren even of them that they themſelves call Brethren: Where
they well know, that Friends do neither own nor call them Br
thren, unleſs it be under the Notion of *falſe Brethren,* ſuch as on
by Profeſſion were Brethren, but now are become *Enemies* to t
Brethren, and to the true Brotherhood.

Next *John Raunce* ſays, that *In the beginning of my Paper* (*like t*
Serpent to Eve) *I uſe fair Words with Craft and Subtilty, to beguile my u*
wary Reader, and ſo darken Council with Words without Knowledg
Where I wonder was his *Knowledge* when he writ this! Is the
any *Craft* and *Subtilty* without *Knowledge*? Here his *Craft* has fa
ed him, and want of *Knowledge* has led him into this Abſurdit
thus to contradict himſelf.

He ſays, *Its true,* B. C. *and* C. H. *publiſhed a Paper, propoſing E*
pedients for Peace and Reconciliation among the People of God called Qu
kers, and (he ſays) *it was very well done.* I ſay, the People of G
called *Quakers,* are at Peace among themſelves, and there is
need of Expedients for Reconciliation amongſt them. *Many Frien*
(ſays he) *earneſtly pray, that Peace may be amongſt us.* I anſwer, t
Peace cannot be amongſt you: For there is *No peace to the Wick*
ſaith my God, Iſai. 57. 21. And ye have wickedly departed from
Lord, and made a wicked Breach, Rent, Diviſion and Separati
from the Church of Chriſt: Friends may and do earneſtly Pr
that they whom Satan by his Inſtruments, hath led aſtray, a
drawn into a wicked ſeparation from Friends, may *through Jud*
m

Quaker Rare BX7732 E5F2
42.4 E25.5F
M:3.B. 7-27-20
7903

ment return, and be brought back to the true Fold again: But no Friend to Truth, and to the Peace and Prosperity of the Church, can desire or endeavour to have Reconciliation made (if that could be) between Friends and their Apostates, while they stand and continue in that Spirit of *Enmity*, *Bitterness*, *Railing*, *Reviling*, *Lying*, *Slanding and Injustice*, wherein they have appeared and yet do.

Again he says, *The Proposals were made for Peace and Reconciliation to differing Friends, as they are a Body of People, &c.* I say again, That Friends, as they are a Body of People, differ not with or among themselves. 'Tis they that are *gone from* Friends, they that are *dropt off from* the Body, and have imbodied themselves as another People, in a *self-Separation* from the Body of Friends; 'tis these that are in the Difference, 'tis these that have made and caused it, tis these that are out of the way of Peace and Reconciliation, into which they can never come again, but *through Judgement*, and by Repentance.

He says, *There is a breach among many of them, about some small matter that are not essential to Salvation; and cannot make us happy in the enjoyment of them.* I answer, If the Matters they have broke about are (in his and their esteem) so *small* it is the greater shame for them, and they are the more to be blamed, for making so *great* a breach about them. Would they hazard their own and others Damnation in making so great a Rent and Breach, about things which they themselves think are not essential to *Salvation?* The *smaller* the things were in their Account, for which they have made so great a Breach, the *greater* will their Judgement and Condemnation be in the day of Account, which the Lord God will assuredly call them to, and which hastens upon them. I desire and intreat those tender People that are beguiled by them, to consider this well, and how they can answer it to the great and righteous God.

He says, *The Paper published by* B. C. *and* C. H. *was to perswade all concerned to endeavour to make up the Breach, in passing by all that hath been done amiss, and to forgive one another wherein any one hath any wise offended.* These words are easily spoken, but the Matter is not so easie to be accomplished. The greatest Offence in this Breach is against God himself. They have thereby caused his holy *Name* to be *Blasphemed* amongst the Unbelievers, his blessed *Truth* to be *despised*, and his Faithful *People* to be *reproached* by the prophane, a-

mongſt whom they have induſtriouſly ſpread their filthy Bo
and Lying Pamphlets, to defame *Friend*. They have perver
the right Way of the Lord, and hath both hindred many from
tring into it, and turned many out of it. This is not a ſmall m
ter; this is not a Light thing, nor lightly to be paſſed by: A
upon good Aſſurance, I am bold to ſay, *the Lord hath not paſſe*
by. Perſonal Wrongs between Man and Man only, are of anot
Nature; but this is not a Wrong to Men as Men: Tis a *wrong*
God, tis a *wrong* to the Truth of God, tis a *wrong* to the Peopl
God, and that as his People. It is not enough therefore for the
fending Party to ſay, *Let all be paſſed by that hath been done amiſs*,
But firſt, let them that have done amiſs, *repent* of their hav
done amiſs, and manifeſt their Repentance by their *Confeſſing*
forſaking thoſe Miſdeeds of theirs. This is the way by which Fa
Man comes to be reconciled to God: And this is the only ri
Way; by which they that have fallen from Truth, and depar
from the Communion of the Faithful can be reſtored to it agai

In my laſt printed Sheet (called *Deceit Diſcovered*, &c.) I ch
ged *L. Key*, and *J. Raunce* particularly (and ſuch others of t
party as joyned with them therein) with *Double dealing* and *De*
in pretending to ſeek Peace and Reconciliation, and propoſing
Oblivion of all things relating to former Differences (which t
did by ſpreading the beforementioned Paper ſigned by *B. C.*
C. H.) and yet at the ſame time ſpread another Paper, tending
revive and dilate the *Difference*, and inform people *afreſh* abou
I forſaw this would pinch, and Hamper *J. Raunce* extreamly,
ſo I find it. He knows not which way to help himſelf off it;
in attempting that, plunges himſelf further in. For having ſpo
of the *Paper* of *Expedients*, he faintly touches on the other Pa
thus. *Now the other Paper (mentioned by* T. E.*) was publiſhed by*
about the ſame time, and is a more particular Buſineſs, wherein
few Perſons are concerned, as being accuſed by T. E. *of many*
things, &c. *J. Raunce*, thus *mincing* the Buſineſs of this Latter
per, ſhews both his *Streight* and his *Deceit*, whereby he would
himſelf out of it, if he could; but he cannot. He ſays, it is *a*
particular Buſineſs wherein but a few Perſons *are concerned.* Yet in
Paper, *L. Key* directs his Reader to *ſee the Memorial for the pr*
Generation, and alſo for that which is to come: It gives an Account

he) *of the Difference that hath happened among the people called Quakers* (not some few persons only) *in these Parts.* This is the Book *J. Raunce* and *C. H.* (though *C. H.* hath since declared that it was Printed without his consent, or knowledge) did publish in the year 1690. to transmit the Difference to the succeeding Age, and as a lasting Monument to *preserve the difference alive.* In the same Paper also, *L. Key* refers his Reader to *see also the Revival that was published from* Reading *in* 1692, *It giving an Account* (he says) *how the Difference was brought in there.* If this Paper of *L. Key's* had related as *J. Raunce* pretends) to a more particular Business, wherein but a few Persons are concerned, and those but such as were accused by *T. E.* what need or use had there been of referring the Reader to those several Papers of theirs, which themselves say *gives an Account of the Difference* that hath happened among the People called *Quakers*, either in *Buckinghamshire* or at *Reading*? Tis manifest, that the Difference *L. Key* there mentions among the People called *Quakers*, and which he would have his Reader (whatever he be) further informed and instructed in, is the same Difference which *B. C.* and *C. H.* (one of them of *Reading* the other of *Buckinghamshire*) pretended to desire a Reconciliation of: And this alone is enough to *Convict J. Raunce of Falshood*, in saying that Paper of *L. Keys* was a more particular Business, wherein but a few Persons were concerned. Besides, in that Paper which *L. Key* calls *The Revival*, (and to which in his other he refers his Reader for fresh Information in the Difference) he recommends to the Readers view about half a Score of their durty Pamplets, by their particular Titles, all relating to the Difference; and among them those those two *abominable Papers*, which (it is said) were *formed* at *Wickam*, and Signed by *S. Aldridge.* Was all this done only with respect to a particular Business, wherein but a few Persons were concerned, that were accused by *T. E.* Or does it not rather manifestly appear, that the design of those who spread those two Papers together (to wit, that of *B. C.* and *C. H.* and that of *L. K.*) was, that while some of the Party made Overtures for Peace, and a shew of desiring Reconciliation, others of the same Party should spread the knowledge of the difference, and of those Books and Papers that were written to justify themselves therein? This is what I called Deceit and double Dealing, and which I still account & call so, and which

sticks

ſticks too faſt upon them, for even *J. Raunce* himſelf, with all
craft and ſubtilty, to wipe off, or clear himſelf from. Yet fr
his falſe premiſes he draws this faulty Concluſion, *So now, from wh
hath been ſaid, all rational perſons may reaſonably conclude that we m
with ſincerity, make Offers of Peace and Reconciliation with a Body
People, and yet at the ſame time have Controverſie with one or more pe
ſons who pretend to be of the ſame Body; and this* (he ſays) *may
done without any breach of Sincerity.* But he cannot without a gre
breach of ſincerity ſay that this is the Caſe in hand. The Matt
I charged them with (& which I do ſtill charge them with, and hi
particularly) was (not having a Controverſy with one or mo
Perſons at the ſame time that they made Offers for Reconciliati
with the Body, but) that at the ſame time that they made Offe
for Peace and Reconciliation with the Body, they endeavoured
renew and ſpread further the Difference which they made the C
fer to have reconciled, and to that end publiſhed anew the Titl
of the Books and Papers they had formerly written to promote a
defend it, and which (as things relating to former Differences
they propoſed, at the ſame time, in their Expedients for Peac
ſhould be buried in Oblivion on all hands (But it ſeems by the
Actions, they did not mean on their own hands.) This was *dou
Dealing* with a Witneſs; and this *double Dealing* ſtands a Witne
ſtill againſt them that did it, particularly *J. Raunce.* His inſta
cing the Controverſie that was between *Paul* and *Barnabas*, to p
rallel this Caſe, is ſo much beſide the Buſineſs, that it ſerves on
to ſhew the ſtreight he is in, and how unable he is to defend hi
ſelf. Had either *Paul* or *Barnabas*, in that Controverſy betwe
themſelves, any Difference alſo with the Church, as theſe Men a
knowledge they have? Or if either of them had, did he in the M
nagement of the particular Controverſie, rip up the difference
had with the Church, and endeavour to ſpread it as publickly, a
as far as he could, and that at the ſame time while he made Offe
for Reconciliation of that very Difference, which he then ſprea
as I have plainly ſhewed, *J. Raunce*, and ſome of theſe men ha
done? If not, what is there in that Caſe to parallel this? Or wh
does *J. Raunces* mentioning that Caſe prove, but his own wea
neſs?

The next thing he paſſes to is the Paper of the Woman fo
me

merly mentioned, and which *L. Key* Printed in his last Sheet, to which *J. Raunce* refers such as desire further satisfaction therein, bidding them read it; and so do I too, with this hint, that they consider it as drawn up, as a Cover for her, by *C. H.* In my last I confirmed the Account I formerly gave of that *foul* Business of the forementionod Woman (so much by them defended) by the Report those grave Women Friends made, whom at the request of the Mens Meeting, the Womens Meeting sent to Examine her, and enquire into that Business; which was, that they found *she had behaved her self very immodestly in her Carriage towards her Father.* This I perceive *gauls J. R.* much, and because he knows not how to Answer it, he indeavours in a Rage, to fling it off thus. *As for what T. E. saith of his Grave Women, who gave the report he mentioned, there is good Cause, and sufficient Ground to look on what he saith about that Business to be a Forgery of his own Brain, and as such, we & all sober People who know* T. E. *shall look upon it, till he prove what he saith.* I do not doubt but I shall satisfy all *sober* People: For I do not look upon them to be *sober* that are *Drunk* with Envy and prejudice: Others if they will not believe my Report (which I do not desire they should) shall have as plain Evidence as *sober* People can desire. I took the Words which I Printed before, exactly out of the Monthly Meeting Book, where they stand as they were entred at that very time, which was in the 11*th Month* 1677. before there was any Separation in this Country, and while J: *Raunce* and *C. Harris* met with us: And I make no doubt but they know it to be true. But because I would not impose upon the Belief of any, I have desired some Friends to view the Book also, and to certify the Matter as they find it; which they have done thus.

'Upon J. *Raunces* questioning the Truth of the Account, which 'Thomas Ellwood formerly published, of the Report made to the 'Monthly Meeting at *Hunger-hill*, by those Women Friends that 'were appointed to enquire into the Misbehaviour of *Elizabeth 'Crutch*, we have (at *Tho. Ellwoods* request) searched the Meeting 'Book, & do find the said Report therein Entred in the 11*th. Month* '1677, in these Words, Viz. *That they being Employed by the Womens 'Meeting to speak with* Elizabeth Crutch *of* Prestwood, *and to en-'quire into the Matter charged against her) did find that she had beha-'ved her self very immodestly in her Carriage towards her Father, and is*

very,

'*very hard and insensible as to Truth.* This we find fairly entred in 'the Meeting Book, without any Blotting, Interlining or Alteration made (that we can perceive, or have ground to suspect) since 'it was written there. Witness our hands this 16*th.* day of the '9*th. Month* 1693.

Tho. Olliffe, *John Penington,*
Daniel Roberts, *Joseph Stephens,*

By this J. *Raunce* may see if he will (but if he will wink, others will see) that he had no Cause nor Ground, to charge me with a Forgery of my own Brain: And if he had had Brain, Honesty, or Civility, I think he would not have done it: For thereby he has but shamed himself, and fixed that foul Matter faster on him.

In the rest of that Paragraph, J. *Raunce* undertakes to maintain and defend their *Account from Wickham*, which is the Book that was written by him and *C. Harris* for a *Memorial of the Difference*; and he Vaunts, that *whatever T. E. hath at any time written against it, he hath not yet proved it false in any one particular.* I do not think either he or I is the fittest Judge in that Case. Let the judicious Reader, that has them both, satisfy himself of that. In the mean time, let me observe how *askew* this looks to the Paper of Proposals for Peace and Reconciliation, in which one Expedient offered was, that *All things relating to former Differences should be buried in Oblivion on all hands.* Did not this *Account* of theirs *from Wickham*, this Monumental Memorial, that was raised for the present Generation, and that which is to come, *to relate to former Differences*? Yes sure, if we may believe *L. Key*, concerning it (for he says) *It gives an Account of the Difference that hath happened among the People called Quakers*:) Or if we may believe it self concerning it self (for it calls it self *An Account from Wickham concerning the Difference among the People called Quakers*, &c.) Well then, according to the *Proposals for Peace* (which *C. Harris* his Name is to) this *Account from Wickham* (which *C. Harris*'s Name is also to) should have been *buried in Oblivion*, or passed by as a thing that was *done amiss* (or which they did amiss in Writing:) For so J. *Raunce* seems to explain their Meaning, when he says, *The Paper published by* B. C. *and* C. H. *was to perswade all concerned, to endeavour to make up the Breach, in passing by all that had been done amiss*, &c. But instead of that, we see here

J. *Raunce*

J. Raunce is extolling and Magnifying that *Account* of theirs *from Wickham* ſtill, as an irreprovable Piece. Doth not this plainly ſhew, that notwithſtanding his Talk of paſſing by all that hath been done amiſs, he would not be thought to have done amiſs himſelf, even in that which was one of his grand Miſdeeds. This ſtill manifeſts *his Deceit* and Infincerity: For it appears by this, that for all their fair Words, and Specious Pretences of paſſing by all that had been done amiſs, and burying in Oblivion all things relating to former Differences; *he had his Reſerve*, and intended ſtill to juſtify himſelf and his Party in what they had done and Written. He applies to me that Text, 1 *John* 2. 11. *He that hateth his brother is in Darkneſs, &c.* and ſays, *I fulfil that ſaying in my own Perſon.* But he ſays falſly: For I neither own them to be my Brethren, nor do I hate them, or any man elſe: Yet their Wickedneſs I hate.

In my laſt Printed Sheet, I ſhewed *L. Key*, a *foul blunder*, that he had made, in ſaying the Year 81. Was above 4 years before the Year 77. And I there alſo ſhewed, that having before *falſifyed* my Words, and *forged* words in my name (which thing I had before charged him with, and he knew not how to clear himſelf of) he had run himſelf into this *fooliſh error* (of placing 81 four Years before 77.) by ſhifting and ſhuffling to hide himſelf, rather than he would honeſtly confeſs his Fault, as common Ingenuity would have led him to have done: Now this *Abſurdity* (in miſreckoning the years) was ſo obvious, and withal ſo *Ridiculous*, that I ſuppoſe the *whole Club*, concerned in *J. Raunces* Paper, concluded it was neceſſary ſomething ſhould be ſaid to take this off. And therefore *J. Raunce*, (who, the Scene being now changed is Advocate for *L. Key*, as *L. Key* had been for him before) though he leaves *L. Key* ſtill in the Briers, about his falſifying my Words (a Diſeaſe it ſeems, beyond the Doctors Cure) endeavours to help him up from his Latter *ſtumble*, thus, If (ſays he) T. E. *were not without all Chriſtian Civility, he would not make ſuch a Clutter about one miſtake of a Word in* L. Keys *Paper which plainly appeareth to be the Printers fault.* Ay, I thought where they would endeavour to *ſhift it off.* Ah poor Printer! ſay I: Printers for the moſt part have faults enough of their own they need not have the Authors Faults laid on them too. But *J. Raunce* ſaith, *It plainly appeareth to be the Prin-*

ters fault, as the matter will make it out: For (says he) *the Word* [before] *is put in the place of the word* [after,] *and the sence of the Matter clearly proveth it.* But that doth not (by J. *Raunces* leave,) *clearly* prove (or at all prove) that it was the *Printers* fault? Why might it not be as well the Authors Fault? Is *L. Key* such an *exact* Writer, that he could not mistake, and put before instead of after, as well as the Printer. They that shall consider, that neither the Author, nor his Friend J. *Raunce*, nor any of the Party (that I have heard of) ever found it, till I shewed it them, above two Months after it was Printed, may have cause to think it was more likely to be the Authors fault, than the Printers. However the Printer it seems must bear the blame. Well, be it so for the present; but I think by that time they have cast up their Accompt anew, they will get no good by laying the Fault upon the Printer. For if the Word *before* is put there in the place of *after*, and that by the printers fault, as J. *Raunce* says positively it is; then we must read the passage in *L. Keys* last Paper thus; *This* (to wit, *G.* F's coming to *Reading* to set up the Womens Meeting in the sixth Month 1681.) *Was above 4 years after that Marriage* which was on the 12*th* of the first Month 1677. And we must conclude that L. *Key* writ so, and intended so. Now let us compute the time, and see whether the 6*th* Month 81. was really above 4 Years *after* the 12*th* of the first Month 77. Now according to my way of Reckoning from the 12*th*. of the first Month 1677. to the 12*th* of the first Month 1680 is but three Years. And from the 12*th*. of the first Month 1680, to the 6*th*. Month 1681. is but six Months at most (let them make more of it if they can:) So that by this *Device*, they have made *L. Key* fall short in his Reckoning above half a year in four. And thus J. *Raunce* has made *L. Keys* case *much worse* than it was before. For whereas before, his placing the year 81 four years before the Year 77. passed but for a *Blunder*, though a *foul* one: Now, his affirming the 6*th*. Month 81. to be above 4 years after the 12*th* of the first Month 77. (when it was above 3 years and an half) will not pass for less than a *downright falshoood*. I have heard J. *Raunce*, in Preaching say, that *he would step into the durt, to help another out*: But now he has stept into the Durt, to help another out, and cannot help either the other or himself out; but there sticks, and wants the help of all his Party (and all too little) to help himself out. For

he

he hath taken this matter upon himself now. He is positive, that *it was the Printers fault*; he saith, *It plainly appeareth to be so; that the Matter will make it out, and that the sense of the Matter clearly proveth it.* Now let him, with all the sense he has, make the Matter out if he can. But I hope he will not lay any more new faults upon the Printer for it. I have not understood they ever laid this Fault upon the Printer, or found it as a fault, till I shewed it them in my last printed Sheet, two Months or more after they had begun to spread theirs. And for my own part, I am strongly perswaded that it was not the Printers Fault, but *L. Keys* own fault; and that they know it to be so, and have designedly invented this shift, to *slide it off* from the Author to the Printer, whereby, as *a just recompence of their Deceit*, they have *plunged* themselves into a *worse Bog*, than they were in before. And indeed, I cannot but still look upon it as an Argument of *judicial Blindness*, and great Infatuation of mind upon them, (how small soever the thing in it self may appear to some) that they should spread that paper of *L. Keys* for so long a time as they did, and none of them, in all that time, should discover that shameful Blunder. And more, that when I had shewed it them, they should now chop upon this Contrivance of casting it off upon the Printer, without seeing thereby that they should run L. *Key* into a far *worse Pit*, than he was in before, by making him guilty of a *downright Falshood*, in affirming that which is *not true*. But in this we may see the Wise Mans saying verified, *The way of the Wicked is as Darkness, they know not at what they stumble.*

The next Passage, to be taken notice of in J. R*aunces* Paper, relates to that *Scandalous Marriage* before mentioned, which J. R*aunce* and others *abetted*, and *carried on* against the mind of the *Monthly Meeting* (to which they then resorted) and to the grief of Friends in this Country. L. *Key* (to excuse J. R*aunce* for bringing that Couple to be Married in a publick Metting of Friends, contrary to the express mind of Friends, and the engagement of the Parties) hath alleadged that *it was then a time of Persecution*, and that he has been told, the people that owned the House (where they proposed to be Married) were not willing a Meeting should be there. J. R*aunce* in a Letter of his to me (dated the 3*d*. of the 3*d*. Month. 90.) says the same. I suspected this Allegation of

J. *Raunces* (that *it was a time of Perſecution*) to be falſe; and ſearching the Records of the Sufferings of Friends in this Country, found no mention of any Perſecution, or ſuffering upon Friends, in theſe parts, for Meetings, in or near that time. This, in my laſt, I objected to L. *Key* and J. *Raunce*, preſſing them, ſince they affirmed *it was a time of Perſecution*, to name, if they could any one Friend that ſuffered about that time on the account of Meetings, in this County. Now ſee J. *Raunce* ſhift to avoid the force of this: the *ſillyeſt*, I think, that ever was. He ſays, *When* T. E. *ſaith that no Friends ſuffered about that time, yet that doth not prove there was no Law in force againſt Meetings at that time. And* T. E. *muſt prove there was no ſuch Law at that time, before he draw ſuch Concluſions as he hath done in his Paper againſt us.* This is extreamly idle. He was put to prove that it *was then* a time of Perſecution (which he had affirmed) inſtead of proving that, he proves that it might have *been* a time of Perſecution, becauſe the Law againſt Meetings was in force, and bids me prove that the Law was not in force: not conſidering, that it is not the Exiſtence or Being of a Law, but the Execution of that Law, that makes a Perſecution. The Law for Burning People for Religion, under the Notion of *Hereticks*, (made ſeveral hundred Years ago) was in force too, I think, at the ſame time (being not repealed till about that time or ſoon after, as I remember.) Now if a Man ſhould have Written that at that time People *were* burnt to death for Religion, and being put to prove it, ſhould think to come off, by ſaying they *might have been*, becauſe the Law for burning *Hereticks* was then in force, that man and J. *Raunce* might have gone together, for a Couple of Wiſe men; but no Body, I ſuppoſe, would have thought them, in that caſe, very honeſt. *Was* and *might have been*, are ſigns I perceive of the *ſame Tenſe*, in J. *Raunces* Grammer. Some perhaps may think this is but a *ſmall* matter. But the Inference I make from it is *great*: For this ſhifting ſhews that he has not *Sincerity*, nor makes Conſcience of Speaking or Writing the Truth; for if he had, he needed not have been driven to this ſhift. Doubtleſs he thought, his alleadging it to be then a time of Perſecution, would excuſe himſelf from the blame laid upon him, and he did not imagine it would have been looked into and diſproved. Nay ſo little care has he of what he ſays, that *even now he Writes another*

plain

plain falſhood, on the ſame occaſion, and which he cannot but know to be one: For mentioning a Letter he ſent me formerly, he ſays, *as in my Letter to him formerly, I then ſaid, the People were unwilling the Meeting concerning the Marriage ſhould be at their houſe, being the Conventicle Act was then in force.* This Letter which he here mentions, is that I mentioned even now, (dated the 3*d* of the 3*d* Month 1690.) Which I have by me to produce. And I do poſitively affirm, there is not any mention of the Conventicle Act in that Letter, as being in force or not in force; it is not at all named therein: But his Words in that Letter are expreſly theſe, *It being a time of Perſecution, the manat whoſe Houſe it ſhould have been accompliſhed was ſo fearful, he was not willing the Meeting ſhould be at his houſe.* Now inſtead of theſe Words (*it being a time of Perſecution*) he does not ſtick to ſay, that in that Letter of his to me he ſaid, (*The Conventicle Act was then in force*;) though he, having the Copy of this Letter by him, could not but know that *thoſe Words are not in his Letter.* So that here are *two untruths*, one upon the Back of the other; One, that *it was then* a time of Perſecution (which *it was not*:) the other, that in that Letter of his to me, *he ſaid*, the Conventicle Act was then in force (which he *did not*,) and both theſe are invented, premeditated and known *Falſhoods*. From which I infer, that J. *Raunce*, to ſave himſelf, doth not regard to ſpeak the Truth, but will ſpeak an *Untruth knowingly*, and make lyes his Refuge.

I did not intend to have taken notice of the *Scurrilous Language* he uſes to and of me, having of late years been ſo accuſtomed to receive ſuch from him, that I expected no better, as knowing from what Fountain it flows. But his complaining of me, for uſing towards them theſe Words, [Envy, Strife, Bitterneſs, Railing, falſe Accuſing and Diviſion] and his calling theſe *Bad Words*, and *ill Manners* in me, made me look more particularly on his Language now to me, and then I could not but wonder at his *Partiality* and *Blindneſs*. For he very freely beſtows upon me theſe Words following, *viz.* [Envy, Craft, Subtilty Slanders, Lyes, Forgeries, a black mark of Envy, Forgery of my own Brain, ſlanderous Reproaches, falſe Accuſations, Impudence and Crafty Subtilties, ſays I am without all Chriſtian Civility, and compares me

to

to the Serpent that beguiled *Eve*,] with more of the like ſort of Language. How theſe ſhould come to be good Words and Manners in him, the ſofteſt of which he accounted bad Words and Manners in me, I cannot imagine. But I obſerve it is frequent with him to condemn me for that which he is guilty of himſelf. Of this another inſtance is in his charging me with abuſing the Dead, that cannot anſwer for, nor defend themſelves, which he makes (as indeed it is) an hainous Crime: Yet he himſelf, in this Paper of his, endeavours with his utmoſt power, to abuſe and defame my Father, who has been dead above theſe ten Years.

That is the next-thing he takes in hand, endeavouring to confirm *L. Key's* former Slander, that I ſuffered my Father to want. One would think J. R*aunce* might have found Work enough in his own Family, to have imployed himſelf about, without raking up Durt to throw at others, and that only upon report, conſidering the *foul Reports* that have gone (and which he knows are not without Ground) upon one as nearly related to him in the deſcendant Line, as my Father to me in the Line aſcendant; Of which he knows I know much, and can perhaps tell him more then he knows. He ſays, *L. Key told in few Words what he can prove at large*; and he would perſwade me, *it was* L. Keys *Kindneſs to expreſs himſelf in theſe modeſt Words*, and that *I had cauſe to acknowledge his Kindneſs to me*. I hope then J. R. will take this as a kindneſs from me (or at leaſt that others will ſee he has cauſe, upon his own ſaying to acknowledge my kindneſs to him) in expreſſing my ſelf in theſe modeſt Words, concerning a near Relation of his, and in telling him in few Words, what I can prove at large, and that with better Evidences and clearer Demonſtration, than *L. Key* or he hath yet given, that I ſuffered my Father to want. And if hereafter I ſhould be drawn to ſay more, on this Subject, than ſhall be pleaſant to him, and ſome of his Relations to hear, they may (as *L. Key* ſays to me) blame themſelves for it.

J. R*aunce* tells me alſo what was intended by charging me with ſuffering my Father to want, *viz. To put me in remembrance wherein I had been ſhort in my duty to my Father.* But to anſwer that end, they ſhould have done this while my Father had been living, that if I had really been ſhort in my Duty to him, there might have

have been time to have amended it. But they ſtaid till he had been dead many years, and then they brought this Story. Why did they not bring this Forth in my Fathers life time? Was it becauſe their Rage and Envy was not then boyled up to ſo great an height as it hath been ſince? Or did they deſignedly conceal it till he was dead, that they might deprive me of the benefit of his Teſtimony to clear me? J. R*aunce* gives another reaſon of their intendment in this Charge againſt me, *viz. And alſo to be as an Admonition for him* (meaning me) *to repent of his Evil doings, and no more to cover his Lies and ſlanderous reproaches with Impudence and crafty Subtilties.* The meaning of this I take to be, that ſeeing they could make up nothing elſe to throw at me, they have thrown this with all their Might and Spight, in hopes they might thereby daunt and baulk me from appearing publickly any more, by Words or Writing, to withſtand and lay open *their Wicked doings.* But by their doing this, they have manifeſted not only their Envy and Revenge, but great *Injuſtice.* For ſuppoſe the Matter were true in Fact, that my Father had wanted, and had Asked Relief (as they affirm) yet how had I been to be blamed therefore, unleſs I had known thereof? it might indeed (did I believe it to be true) affect me with *Grief*, that my Father ſhould reduce himſelf to ſuch ſtreights: But it could not affect me with Guilt, ſo long as I knew not of it. But theſe Men in their Envy run on at a Venture, and affirm, not only that my Father wanted, but that *I ſuffered him to want.* Did he ever tell them that he had made known his Wants to me, and that I refuſed to help him? Or did any of them ever tell me ſo? Let them ſay it if they can: I know it *is falſe*; and that they are falſe Accuſers, in charging me with *ſuffering* my Father to want in caſe he did want.

In the next place, J. R*aunce* falls upon me for not being at my Fathers Burial, the Reaſon I gave in my laſt, for my abſence, doth not ſatisfy him; though it doth others. It was this, *viz.* That my Father having received a Meſſage in his Sickneſs, that my Siſter lay then ſick in *London*, near unto Death, after I had waited upon him till he had finiſhed his Life, and given direction for his Interment, I haſted up to my Siſter at *London*, as thinking I might be more ſerviceable to the Living then the Dead. To this J. R*aunce* ſays, *He need not have been in ſo much haſte at that time.* It

may

may be so, but that was more then I knew. Had I been as skilful in *casting Figures* as J. *Raunce* is said to have been (and perhaps yet is) I might, it may be, have better known (if it be that way to be known) what haste to have made, or leisure to have taken. I went simply and innocently upon the account received of her illness, not knowing how I should find her till I came there. She might have been in extremity of weakness, for ought I knew, and from the Message brought my Father, I had no ground to expect other. But when I came to her I found her in a way of recovery, and before I left her she was able to go abroad. That also J. *Raunce* Objects, though (as the rest) but upon report: *for* (says he) *it hath been reported by some that knew his Sister, that she was not so ill at that time, but that she could Accompany her Brother to their deceased Fathers Chamber, to view what Goods he had left.* I wonder truly, that they would allow my Father to have had either *Goods* or *Chamber* at the time of his Death: For this does not so clearly square with the rest of their *Design* for *defaming* him and me; and to considering Persons this may perhaps render the rest of their Story the *less probable.* But this by the by. As to J. *Raunces* Objection, he seems methinks not much to credit his Skill in Physick, if he knows not that, in *Acute* Distempers, Ten days or a Fortnights time doth often raise a Sick Body into a Condition to be able to go abroad. And such a space of time, I suppose, there might be between the Messengers being with her (who brought my Father the Account of her illness) and her going to his Chamber. J. *Raunce* says, *It had been more Christian-like for them both (if in health) to have accompanyed their deceased Fathers Body to the place of Burial, as the last Office Children ought to perform to their deceased Parents.* I acknowledge that it becomes Children to accompany their deceased Parents to the Grave: But I do not look upon it to be such an *Indispensible* Duty, but that it may upon *weighty* and *urgent* Occasions, be omitted; without breach of Christianity, or Filial Piety. By his saying [*if in health*] he grants that *want of health* may excuse from the performance of that Duty: And *want of health* it was (in my Sister) that hindred both her and me But that it is not (at least always) the last Office Children have to perform to their deceased Parents, the present instance proves: For these men have furnished me with *another Office*, now ten Years after my Fathers Burial, to vindicate his

his Memory from their envious Cavils and Defamations.

Is it not ſtrange, that after all the Endeavours J. *Raunce* hath uſed to *diſgrace* my Father, he ſhould pretend Friendſhip and Kindneſs to him? *He was informed* (he ſays) *ſome Weeks after my Father died, that he was dead, and Buried in* Holton Steeple-yard, *where* (he ſays) *they uſually Buried Beggars.* (I perceive he accounts it an hainous thing to be Buried in the ſame Ground where Beggars are Buried. Had he then rather lye by *Dives* then by *Lazarus*? I wiſh it may not be his Lot.) *And being troubled* (he ſays) *at what he heard concerning the Death and Burial of his old Friend* Walter Ellwood, *he enquired of the People at whoſe houſe he dyed, and they ſhewed him the Grave, and things appeared to be true as before he was informed*, that is, *that he was Dead and Buried in* Holton Steeple-yard. Here he calls my Father his *old Friend*, and pretends to have been troubled at the hearing of his Death and Burial; yet endeavours thus many years after his Death, to *Diſgrace him* to the utmoſt. If this be the effect of his Friendſhip, I ſhall not deſire to be Numbred among his Friends. I obſerve he ſays the Enquiry he then made was *ſome few Weeks after my Father died*, which is ten years ago: So that what he then gathered, has been Treaſured up ever ſince in a *corrupt Heart*, till it brake forth of late, in ſuch apparent marks of Envy and Revenge, that even ſome, who in other things uſe to think well of J. *Raunce*, cannot but expreſs their diſlike of him in this. And indeed 'tis ſtrange to obſerve the *Pains* and *toyle* theſe men have taken, the induſtrious *care* and *diligence* they have uſed, in hunting up and down, both in City and Country; the *ſubtile* ways and crafty *Wiles* they have uſed in ſearching, enquiring, ſifting, examining, queſtioning, trying and tampering with People of diverſe ſorts, to pick up (if poſſible) ſomething againſt me, relating to this Buſineſs of my Father. Which ſhews they were reſolved *at any rate*, and whatſoever it coſt them to defame me, if they could. They had ſifted the people of the Houſe where my Father died, ſome time ago: And not finding any thing there that anſwered their End, they perſwaded the People not to be ſatisfyed with what I had given them, afeer my Fathers death, upon the Account of his be-

ing there, though that was more than they then demanded. Though this did not Answer their main Design of Disgracing me, yet it was some pleasure to them to put me to further Charge. This Summer they *ravelled* and *Travelled* further; they have sought out the man whom my Father, when he was taken ill, sent to *London* to my Sister for Money. They have sifted him, and finding him poor, perswaded him to write what they would have him, under pretence of having shewed kindness to my Father, putting him in hopes of getting something thereby from me for him. What he writ they ordered him to leave with an Acquaintance of his, (one of their Party, and a great *Agent* of theirs, but one who was *denyed by Friends some years ago, for marrying a Woman of the World, and by a Priest.*) Accordingly the poor Man writ a Letter, as they would have him, (for he says he had no intention to have Writ or sent to me, but that they put him upon it) and left it (unsealed, and undirected) with their Agent for him to send to them, and they to me; and to me it came by *Wickham*, enclosed in a Letter from *L. Key*, and is that which *L. Key* now mentions. And some of them I understand, have sent the man half a Crown for his Information. Not resting there, they have also been hunting at *London*, to find out the Place where my Father Lodged: And from the Man (as is pretended) in whose house he had a Chamber, they have *Squeezed* out what they could or would; and what they have thus either found or made, and *scrapt together* from City and Country, *L. Key* hath *patched up* together, to *piece out* J. *Raunces* Paper.

But as for the Account *L. Key* now gives, to confirm his former Slander upon me, that I suffered my Father to want, the Reader may guess of what Credit it is, by the place where it was *Minted*, *viz.* *The* Mint *London*, the common receptacle of People of broken Credits. He names a Shoomaker, at whose house he says, my Father had a Room. I do not believe, nor ever heard, my Father ever had a Room in the *Mint*: I am sure he had not at the time of his Death. *L. Key* makes that Shoomaker say, that my Father *went about the City a Begging, as a poor decayed Gentleman.* But it is observable the Shoomaker doth not

say

ſay that *upon his own Knowledge*, but pretends to have heard it from others, and to have believed it upon no other ground, but becauſe *he knew no other way he had for a Livelyhood*. But doth it follow that he had no other way of Livelyhood, becauſe the Shoomaker knew of no other way he had? Beſides, their Stories do not hang well together. They repreſent him as going about the City a Begging, as a Poor decayed Gentleman: And yet they repreſent him alſo, as *never having any Money either in City or Country*. Sure he begg'd to little purpoſe then. But let them make the moſt they can of their *Ill-gotten* Informations. I think it will not, by any reaſonable Perſons, be expected, that I ſhould prove *the Negative*, or ſay, I am certain he never did want (though I do not believe he did.) But this I can and do ſay, firſt, That if my Father had been ſo frugal of what he had, as it concerned him, for his own ſake (not to ſay for his Childrens) to have been, he needed not have wanted (if he did.) Secondly, That when he had ſpent his Eſtate, if he had let me know that he was in want, he ſhould not have wanted, while I had been able to help him. But he never diſcovered any ſuch thing to me. And if the *Teſtimony* of a Friend, *upon his own knowledge*, may find equal Credit with the *Surmiſes* of Enemies, or *Tales* of Strangers upon *Report*, I think the following Letter (which I received from a Friend, who formerly kept one of the chief *Inns* in *Uxbridge*, and at whoſe houſe my Father, it ſeems did ſometimes lye) will make it appear, that he was *not ſo deſtitute of* Money as theſe men would repreſent him to have been. That Letter ſays thus,

Loving Friend Tho. Ellwood. *Uxbridge* 23. 9. *Month* 93.

'*Since I read a Paper* (*which was ſome trouble to me, it being ſo full* '*of Envy and prejudice*) *which ſignified that thou* ſuffered thy Father 'to go a Begging, *I do remember that about Eleven or Twelve years* '*age, when I kept the Inn, he came ſeveral times to my houſe, and I* '*never ſaw him but in very good gentile Habit, and he had always* '*Monies ſufficient to pay for what he had occaſion for, ſo that I re-* '*member* (*before he told me who he was*) *he was put in one of the beſt* '*Rooms I had.*

Thy loving Friend,
Rich. Richardſon.

This could not be long before my Fathers Death: For he hath been dead above ten Years. And this Teſtimony Providence has helped me to: For I knew not that my Father had ever uſed this Friends houſe, till the Friend himſelf (ſeeing my Enemies Envy) acquainted me with it, and ſent me this, which I thought fit to inſert here.

Tis well known to many, that my Father was poſſeſt of a good Eſtate: And they that knew him well, know alſo, that he had the ſpending of it himſelf. How he ſpent it becomes not me to ſpeak. He was my Father, to whom I ow'd, and always paid Reſpect and Honour while Living, and whoſe Frailties being dead, I deſire to cover. It is enough for me to ſay, I did not help him ſpend his Eſtate; Nor was I much chargeable to him, after I was capable of ſhifting for my ſelf. And when it pleaſed the Lord to viſit me with the ſaving knowledge of his Truth, and bring me under the viſible Characters of the Profeſſion thereof (which was about the 20*th* year of my Age) my Father, expreſſing a diſlike to me on that account, by degrees withdrew his Care of me, not making any Proviſion for my Maintenance, ſave the giving me ſuch of his Houſhold Goods, as he could ſpare, upon his giving over Houſe Keeping; though he had then a plentiful Eſtate Remaining. When afterwards he ſold his Eſtate, I had no part at all of the Money, though (at his deſire I joined with him in the ſale, and at my own charge. I mention this only to ſhew, that I was not inſtrumental to bring him down in the World. After he had ſold the laſt of his Eſtate, and had paid all his Debts, he had Eight hundred Pounds left clear to himſelf (as he told me) and no body to maintain out of it but himſelf. When I acquainted him with my intention of Marriage, in order to have his Conſent thereunto, he voluntarily offered to give me Two hundred Pounds preſent, upon my Marriage, and Three hundred Pounds more at his Death; and propoſed the ſame to my Wife, before I Married her. After we were Married he refuſed to give me any thing, unleſs we would be Married by a Prieſt. From that time he ſo far withdrew himſelf from me, that he would not let me know where he Lodged, but if I found his Lodging he removed; nor

did

did I know where his Lodging was at the time of his Death, though I knew he had a Lodging in or about *London*. Notwithstanding this, he would sometimes come to my House, which was always open and free to him, to come when he pleased, and to tarry as long as he pleased. When never he came, he was well habited, both for Linnen and Woolen, and made no appearance of Want, other then such as may befal any man, to have his Money fall short in a Journey: Upon which Occasion, (when he had, as he said, been longer from home than he expected, or when, being here, he had a mind to go further then at his coming forth he intended) he has divers times asked me to lend him Money, which I always did, and never asked him for it again. And to the best of my Remembrance, it was not above two Weeks time before his last Sickness, that he had been at my House, and had Money of me on that account. As soon as I heard of his illness I hastened to him, and took the best care of his I could during his Life, and after his Death, defrayed the Charge of his Sickness and Burial, and repaid to my Sister that Money which she had sent him before I knew of his illness. I could say more on this Subject than I intend, or at present think fit: But I forbear, and commit my innocent Cause to the Lord, not doubting but that, as I am clear in his sight from any undutifulness, or unkindness towards my Father, so he will clear my innocency in the hearts of his Peopls, and of all unprejudiced Persons.

POSTSCRIPT.

SInce the former part was Written, I hear J. Raunce hath hatched another falſe ſtory againſt me, which is, That I did not allow my Father a Shrowd; but that he was wrapt in an old Motheaten Blanket. This he hath lately Broached, and ſpread about the Country, ſince the Printing of his Paper of Reflections: And upon this I hear, he rejoices much, and inſults greatly. But the Triumphing of the Wicked (we read) is ſhort, and the joy of the Hypocrite but for a Moment, Job. 21. 5. And ſo J. Raunces will be, when he finds his Blow will not reach me, as I am ſure it will not: For I did allow my Father a Shrowd, and I paid for it. I ordered the Woman of the Houſe (where he died) to buy a Shrowd; and that being the Market Day at Wendover, whether her Husband was to go, ſhe deſired him (in my hearing) to buy or beſpeak, the Shrowd at ſuch a Shop (which ſhe then named) in Wendover. Afterward, when I went thither again, to defray the Charge of the Houſe, they reckoned a Shrowd to me, and they told me what it coſt, and what they told me it coſt I paid them for it. And truly, though the People were Strangers to me, I cannot lightly harbour ſo ill an Opinion of them, as to think they would do ſo ill a thing; nor do I believe they did ſo. But if they had done ſo, the fault had been theirs, not mine, who was wholly ignorant of it, nor

eve

ever heard of it till now. And therefore John Raunce *doth* very unjuſtly, *as well as* unlike a Chriſtian, *in Reproaching me therewith.*

Pſal. 7. 14. *Behold he Travelleth with Iniquity, and hath conceived Miſchief, and brought forth Falſhood.*

Pro. 11. 9. *An Hypocrite with his mouth deſtroyeth his Neighbour: But through knowledge ſhall the Juſt be delivered.*

Pſa. 120. 2. *Deliver my Soul, O Lord, from lying lips, and from a Deceitful Tongue.*

T. E.

THE END.

Thomas Ellwood

London, Printed by *T. Sowle* at the *Crooked Billet* in *Holy well-Lane Shere-ditch*, Anno. 1693.